

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 19, 2004. In order to advance prosecution of the present Application, Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 21-23, 24-26, 28, 29, 32-34, and 36-38 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

Claims 1-38 stand provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-48 of copending U.S. Application Serial No. 10/086,757. Attached herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer with check to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-6, 9-18, 21-29, 32-36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Biffar. Independent Claims 1, 13, 24, 36, and 38 recite in general an ability to determine one or more configuration choices for which a second GUI element needs to be drawn for display to a user associated with the client system in connection with the configuration workflow in response to the configuration choice selection of the first GUI element. By contrast, the Biffar patent allows all choices to be made available at each selection opportunity regardless of what selection was made at a particular selection opportunity. It is only after the user has made all selections that the system informs the user that certain choices are not possible based on the selections made. See col. 11, line 23, to col. 12, line 16, of the Biffar patent. Thus, the Biffar patent is not capable of automatically updating GUI elements in order to provide available configuration choices in response to a configuration choice selection as required in the claimed invention. Support for the above recitation can be found at page 11, line 19, to page 12, line 27, of Applicant's specification.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-6, 9-18, 21-29, 32-36, and 38 are not anticipated by the Biffar patent.

Claims 7, 19, 30, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biffar in view of Ahluwalia. Independent Claim 1, from which Claim 7 depends; Independent Claim 13, from which Claim 19 depends; and Independent Claim 24, from which Claim 30 depends, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Biffar patent. Additionally, Independent Claim 37 has been amended to include similar limitations provided in Claim 36 and shown above to be patentable distinct from the Biffar patent. Moreover, the Ahluwalia patent does not include any additional material combinable with the Biffar patent that would be material to patentability of these claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 7, 19, 30, and 37 are patentably distinct from the proposed Biffar - Ahluwalia combination.

Claims 8, 20, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Biffar. Independent Claim 1, from which Claim 8 depends; Independent Claim 13, from which Claim 20 depends; and Independent Claim 24, from which Claim 31 depends, have been shown above to be patentably distinct from the Biffar patent. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 8, 20, and 31 are patentably distinct from the Biffar patent.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place the Application in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Christopher W. Kennerly
Reg. No. 40,675

February 18, 2005

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, TX 75201-2980
(214) 953-6507
Customer Number: 05073